

Remarks

Claims 91-98, 100-103 and 163-182 are pending in the Application.

Claims 91-98, 100-103 and 163-182 are rejected.

Claims 91-94, 98, 100, 169-176, and 178 are amended herein.

I. EXAMINER INTERVIEW

On January 27, 2005, the undersigned counsel for Applicant and an inventor of the invention (Dr. Ken Smith) met with the Examiner to discuss the Application and the Final Office Action. Applicant and its counsel appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion and wish to thank the Examiner for the interview.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Examiner has rejected Claims 91, 93, 94-97, 100, 163-178 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Guo et al., "Catalytic growth of single-walled nanotubes by laser vaporization", *Chem. Phys. Letters* **243** (1995) pp 49-54 ("*Guo*"), alone or in view of Wang, et al., "Growth and characterization of buckybundles", *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 62 (16), 19 April 1993, pp. 1881-3 ("*Wang*"). Office Action, at 2. Examiner has further rejected Claims 98, 101-103 and 179-182 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over *Guo*, alone or in view of *Wang*, and taken with Applicant's admissions in the specification and Fishbine, "Carbon Nanotube Alignment and Manipulation Using Electrostatic Fields," *Fullerene Science & Technology*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 87-100, 1996 ("*Fishbine*"). Office Action, at 2. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

During the interview with the Examiner, the Applicant and the Examiner discussed modifying the claims to more recite the feature that the claimed invention comprised "about 10⁶ single-wall carbon nanotubes bundled together in generally parallel orientation." Such element more particularly conforms the claims to distinguishing features of the invention that are not,

disclosed, taught, or suggested in any of the cited art (*i.e. Guo, Wang, and Fishine*). See Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, dated August 30, 2004, at 7-19.

Accordingly, Applicant has modified independent Claims to more affirmatively recite these distinguishing features. Therefore, as a result of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claims 91-98, 100-103 and 163-182 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.


V. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicant that the Claims in the Application are now in a condition for allowance, and respectfully request allowance of such Claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call Applicant's attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Ross Spencer Garsson
Reg. No. 38,150

P.O. Box 50784
Dallas, Texas 75201
Tel.: (512) 370-2870
Fax: (214) 745-5390

Austin_1\272600\1
11321-P012USD8 2/7/2005